





tion and justice, forbids me to anticipate the possibility of the failure of our endeavors applied with sincerity to this purpose.

With this view of the case, therefore, although not unprepared to enter into the general argument, I abstain from so doing from the conviction that an amicable settlement of this vexed question, so generally desired, will be thereby best promoted. But, at the same time, some opinions have been industriously circulated throughout this country, and in some instances by persons in authority, of a description so much calculated to mislead the public mind, that I think it may be of service to offer a few observations.

I do not, of course, complain of the earnest adherence of partisans on either side to the general arguments on which their case is supposed to rest. But a position has been taken, and facts have been repeatedly stated, which I am sure the authorities of the Federal Government will be abundantly able to contradict, but which have evidently given rise to much public misapprehension. It is maintained that the whole of this controversy began in 1814: that up to that period the line as claimed by Maine was undisputed by Great Britain, and that the claim was avowedly founded on motives of interest, to obtain the means of conveniently connecting the British Provinces. I confine these remarks to the refuting this impression, and I should, indeed, not have entered upon the controversy, even on this, if it did not appear to involve in some degree a question of national sincerity and good faith.

The assertion is founded on the discussions which preceded the treaty of peace signed at Ghent, in 1814. It is perfectly true that a proposal was submitted by the British plenipotentiaries for the revision of the boundary line on the northeastern frontier, and it was founded on the position that it was desired to secure the communication between the provinces, the precise delineation of which was at that time imperfectly known. The American plenipotentiaries, in their first communication from Ghent to the Secretary of State, admit that the British ministers disclaimed any intention of acquiring an increase of territory, and that they proposed the revision for the purpose of preventing uncertainty and dispute—a purpose sufficiently justified by subsequent events. Again, in their note of the 14th of Sept. 1814, the British ministers remind those from America that the boundary line has never been ascertained, and that the line claimed by America, which interrupted the communication between Halifax and Quebec, never could have been in the contemplation of the parties to the treaty of peace in 1783.

The same view of the case will be found to pervade all the communications between the plenipotentiaries of the two countries at Ghent. There was no attempt to press any cession of territory on the ground of policy or expediency; but the precise geography of the country was not known, it was notorious at the time that different opinions existed as to the boundary likely to result from continuing the north line from the head of the river St. Croix. This appears to have been so clearly known and admitted by the American plenipotentiaries, that they, in submitting to the conference the project of a treaty, offer a preamble to their fourth article in these words: "Whereas neither that part of the highlands lying due north from the source of the river St. Croix, and designated in the former treaty of peace between the two powers, as the Northwest angle of Nova Scotia, nor the northwesternmost head of Connecticut river, has yet been ascertained," &c.

It should here be observed that these are the words proposed, not by the British, but by the American plenipotentiaries, and that they were finally adopted by both in the 5th article of the treaty.

To close my observations upon what passed on this subject at Ghent, I would draw your attention to the letter of Mr. Gallatin, one of the American plenipotentiaries, to Mr. Secretary Monroe, on the 25th Dec. 1814.

He offers the following conjecture as to what might probably be the arguments of Great Britain against the line set up by America: "They hope that the river which empties into the Bay de Chaleurs in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, has its source so far west as to intervene between the head waters of the St. Johns, and those of the streams emptying into the St. Lawrence: so that the line north from the river St. Croix will strike the heights of land which divide the waters emptying into the Atlantic ocean (river St. Johns) from those emptying into the Gulf of St. Lawrence (river de Chaleurs) and afterward the heights of land which divide the waters emptying into the Gulf of St. Lawrence (river de Chaleurs) from those emptying into the river St. Lawrence; but that the said line never can, in the words of the treaty, strike any spot of land actually dividing the waters emptying into the Atlantic ocean, from those which empty into the river St. Lawrence."

So obvious an argument in opposition to the line claimed by America could not escape the known sagacity of Mr. Gallatin. I state it not for the purpose of discussing its merits, but to show that, at Ghent, not only the fact was well known that this boundary was a matter in dispute, but that the argument respecting it had been weighed by the gentlemen so eminent in its subsequent discussion.

Indeed the fact that the American plenipotentiaries made the disputed question a matter for reference, by a treaty afterward ratified by the President and Senate, must to every candid mind be sufficient proof that it was generally considered to be involved in sufficient doubt to entitle it to such a mode of solution. It cannot, possibly, be supposed that the President and Senate would have admitted, by treaty, doubts respecting this boundary, if they had been heard of for the first time through the pretensions of the British plenipotentiaries at Ghent.

If the argument or assertions which I am now noticing, and to which I studiously confine myself had not come from authority, I should owe some apology for these observations. The history of this important controversy is too well known to you, sir, and stands too voluminously recorded in your department, to make them necessary for your own information.

The repeated discussions between the two countries and the repeated project for settlement which have occupied every succeeding administration of the United States, sufficiently prove how unfounded is the assertion that the doubts

and difficulties respecting this boundary had their first origin in the year 1814. It is true that down to that time, and indeed to a later period, the local features of the country were little known, and the different arguments had in consequence not assumed any definite form; but sufficient was known to both parties to satisfy them of the impossibility of tracing strictly the boundary prescribed by the treaty of peace in 1783. I would prefer in proof of this, simply to American authorities and those of the very first order.

In the year 1802, Mr. Madison, at that time Secretary of the State for the United States, in his instructions to Mr. Rufus King, observed that the difficulty in fixing the northwest angle of Nova Scotia, "arises from a reference in the treaty of 1783, to highlands which it is now found have no definite existence." And he suggests the appointment of a commission, to be jointly appointed, "to determine on a point most proper to be substituted for the description in article II of the treaty in 1783." Again, Mr. President Jefferson, in a message to Congress, on the 17th October, 1803, stated that "a farther knowledge of the ground in the northeastern or northwestern angles of the United States has evinced that the boundaries established by the treaty of Paris, between the British territory and ours, in those points, were too imperfectly described to be susceptible of execution." These opinions of two most distinguished American statesmen gave rise to a convention of boundary, made in London by Rufus King and Lord Hawesbury, which from other circumstances, which it is not necessary to refer to, was not ratified by the Senate.

I might further refer you on this subject to the report of Judge Sullivan, who acted as a commissioner of the United States, for settling the controversy with Great Britain, respecting the true river St. Croix, who says, "the boundary between Nova Scotia and Canada was described by the King's proclamation in the same mode of expression as that used in the treaty of peace. Commissioners who were appointed to settle that line have traversed the country in vain to find the highlands designated as the boundary."

With these known facts, how can it possibly be maintained that doubts about the boundary arose for the first time in the year 1814?

I need not pursue this subject farther. Indeed, it would have been useless to treat of it at all with any person having before him the records of the diplomatic history of the two countries for the last half century. My object in adverting to it is to correct an error arising, I am ready to believe, not from any intention to misrepresent, but from want of information, and which seemed to be sufficiently calculated to make some refutation useful toward promoting the desired friendly and equitable settlement of this question.

We believe the position maintained by us on the subject of this boundary to be founded in justice and equity; and we deny that we have been determined in our pretensions by policy and expediency.

I might, perhaps, fairly admit, that those last mentioned considerations have prompted in some measure, our perseverance in maintaining them. The territory in controversy is (for that portion of it at least which is likely to come to Great Britain by any amicable settlement,) as worthless for any purpose of habitation or cultivation, as probably any tract of equal size on the habitable globe, and if it were not for the obvious circumstance of its connecting the British North American provinces, I believe I might venture to say, that whatever might have been the merit of our case, we should long since have given up the controversy, and willingly have made the sacrifice to the wishes of a country with which it is so much our interest, as it is our desire, to maintain the most perfect harmony and good will.

I trust that this sentiment must be manifest in my unreserved communication with you on this, and on all other subjects connected with my mission. If I have failed in this respect, I shall have ill obeyed the instructions of my Government and the earnest dictates of my personal inclination. Permit me, sir, to avail myself of this, my first opportunity of formally addressing you, to assure you unfeignedly of my most distinguished consideration.

ASHBURTON  
Hon. Daniel Webster, &c. &c.

Mr. Webster to Lord Ashburton.  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, June 17, 1842.

Lord Ashburton having been charged by the Queen's Government, with full powers to negotiate and settle all matters of discussion between the United States and England, and having, on his arrival at Washington, announced that, in relation to the question of the north-eastern boundary of the United States, he was authorized to treat for a conventional line, a line by agreement, on such terms and conditions, and with such mutual considerations and equivalents, as might be thought just and equitable, and that he was ready to enter upon a negotiation for such conventional line, so soon as this Government should say that it was authorized and ready, on its part, to commence such negotiation—the undersigned, Secretary of State of the United States, has now the honor to acquaint his Lordship, by direction of the President, that the undersigned is ready, on behalf of the Government of the United States, and duly authorized to proceed to the conventional line, or line by agreement, and will be happy to have an interview on this subject, at his Lordship's convenience.

The undersigned avails himself of this occasion to tender to Lord Ashburton assurances of his distinguished consideration.

DANIEL WEBSTER.  
Lord Ashburton, &c. &c.

Lord Ashburton to Mr. Webster.  
Washington, June 17, 1842.

The undersigned, Plenipotentiary of Her Britannic Majesty, on an extraordinary and special mission to the United States of America, has the honor of acknowledging, with much satisfaction, the communication received to-day from Mr. Webster, Secretary of State of the United States, that he is ready, on behalf of the United States, and duly authorized, in relation to the question of the north-eastern boundary of the United States, to proceed to the consideration of a conventional line, or line by agreement, on such terms and conditions, and with such mutual considerations

and equivalents as might be thought just and equitable. And in reply to Mr. Webster's invitation to the undersigned, to fix some time for their conference upon this subject, he begs to propose to call on Mr. Webster, at the Department of State, to-morrow, at 12 o'clock, for this purpose, should that time be perfectly convenient to Mr. Webster.

The undersigned avails himself of this opportunity to assure Mr. Webster of his distinguished consideration.

ASHBURTON.  
Hon. Daniel Webster, &c. &c.

Mr. Webster to Lord Ashburton.  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, June 17, 1842.

The Secretary of State will have great pleasure in seeing Lord Ashburton at 12 o'clock to-morrow, as proposed by him.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

#### DEVELOPMENTS.

No additional evidence was needed to convince intelligent men of the fraud committed on the people in the Presidential election of 1840; but Mr. Wise and the Madisonians are disclosing some particulars which ought not to escape public attention. In an editorial article of yesterday, the Madisonian, in effect, makes the following statements, viz:

"That John Tyler, late in the winter of 1839, or early in the spring of 1840, was consulted by certain individuals as to his opinion with respect to a United States Bank; that, in answer, he addressed a letter to Hon. Henry A. Wise, stating it as his opinion that a Bank of the United States was unconstitutional, and that he never could sanction the incorporation of one, without an alteration of the Constitution."

"This letter was exhibited to all the leading Whigs in Congress, for their perusal, and for their advice as to the expediency of its publication; and they deprecated, most eloquently, any revelation of its contents to the public, for fear it might hurt the ticket, where the question of a United States Bank was popular."

There are two aspects in which the facts here disclosed illustrate the character of Whiggery. First, the concealment of John Tyler's opinion from the people, lest the truth should "hurt the ticket." This was a fraud on such of the people as were in favor of a bank.

Secondly, the conduct of the leading Whigs towards John Tyler, in charging him with bad faith and treason to the Whig party for his veto of the bank bill, when they had his written declaration, made before the election, that he considered a Bank of the United States unconstitutional! The Madisonian says, some of those very members of Congress "who strongly protested against Mr. Tyler's wish for the publication of his letter, are the same persons who now most loudly attack him with the charge of gross inconsistency of opinion, and treachery in conduct." Such is the character of Whiggery!

These facts tend to elevate Mr. Tyler. It now appears that he not only avowed his opinion in writing, but wished it published. His error was in not making known those opinions himself. He should not have remained the quiet instrument of those whom he knew to be practicing a fraud on the public, by withholding his opinions, as well as those of General Harrison, from "the public eye." For that error, he is now punished by the abuse of the knaves whom he suffered to use him; but, compared with them, history will pronounce him an angel of light.

In the following statements, the Madisonian makes important disclosures in reference to a later period, which further illustrate the character of Whiggery, viz:

"John Tyler, President of the U. States, so far from using the question of a Bank or no Bank as a means to forward his re-election, distinctly and emphatically announced to his first Cabinet his cheerful willingness to declare his intention of retiring after the close of the first term, so that his settled conviction of the inexpediency and unconstitutionality of a Bank should not be interpreted into a desire to propitiate the popular sentiment to his support—and that his Cabinet dissuaded him from any such expression of his independent, honest feeling."

"A committee of the members of the present Congress waited on Mr. Cushing and requested him to state to the President, that the question of a United States Bank should no longer be agitated, if he (the President) would promise to retain the Cabinet as it was constituted by General Harrison."

What will be thought, after this disclosure, of those members of the 'first cabinet' who resigned, charging the President with duplicity on this very subject?

But the last item lays bare the character of Whiggery. "Men, not principles," should be their motto. They were willing to give up that great 'Whig principle'—a National Bank—if only the original cabinet could be retained!—Office was preferred to principle. The cabinet were willing, for the sake of office, to give up a bank. But when they could not get a promise of being retained in office, they resigned, to avoid being turned out, and made themselves the victims of principle!

This is whiggery all over. False, treacherous, selfish, and unprincipled—by concealing its principles, it gained power; and to keep it, was ready to abjure them; but when by such means, the end cannot be attained, it becomes all at once the pure and disinterested lover of principle, sacrificing office for its sake.

But why were the Whigs so anxious to retain Harrison's cabinet? For this plain reason:—With one exception it was a Clay Cabinet. It was constructed to give Henry Clay the benefit of all the domestic patronage of the Government in a contest for the succession. Butcher Ewing, and his associate Granger, were to place all the offices of the Treasury and Post Office in the hands of Mr. Clay's most unscrupulous partisans. Ewing was performing his bloody work without mercy or remorse; and Granger has boasted in Congress that he decapitated 1,700 postmasters in his short short reign, and in one year would have added 3,000 more to the list. To finish this work for the benefit of Henry Clay, the Whigs of Congress desired to keep the butchers in office, and, to accomplish it, offered to give up the bank! For this price, they were ready

to sell their principles, and to barter away "Whig measures;" but the Captain declined the bargain! It was then that "head him or die" became the Whig motto; and we have seen a nine months' regular session of Congress, besides several months "extra," chiefly spent in this profligate game.

The Madisonian promises further disclosures, and we bid it God speed. While it is wipng wicked aspersions from the character of President Tyler, it is doing justice to an outraged people, and furnishing authentic materials for a history of the Whig party.—Globe.

#### OXFORD DEMOCRAT.

PARIS, OCTOBER 11, 1842.

A GLANCE AT THE OPERATION OF THE NEW TARIFF.—The tariff has been looked upon in some quarters as the harbinger of improved trade in all directions, although no one has undertaken to show, by what possible operation the means of the people to purchase goods at higher prices can be improved by it. The mere fact, that, with markets glutted with goods of all descriptions, foreign and domestic, a tariff has been passed prohibiting the future introduction of some of those goods, produces no positive benefit to the people at large, nor does it give any immediate relief to the manufacturers. It only holds out to the latter, the hope that, in future years, after the present stock of goods shall be consumed, they may obtain at least present prices for those which hereafter may be manufactured. This, in regard to trade, is the whole length and breadth of the tariff. In regard to revenue it will most undoubtedly diminish the customs.

The effect of the new tariff will be in a degree, by excluding foreign goods that might come here in exchange for produce, to diminish the foreign market, and by retaining the surplus produce at home, sink the value of the whole crop to a fearful extent. In 1840, 600,000 barrels of flour were sent to England, in exchange for iron and cloths, or rather iron and cloths were sent here and the flour taken in payment and carried back. That method of disposing of the surplus is now checked greatly by the tariff, and the farmers are called upon to pay higher prices for all the iron they use, and all the clothes they wear.

The manufacturers have promised the farmers that if the tariff was imposed, they would buy more flour and pork at better prices. Let us see what chance there is of such an event. Abbott Lawrence, Esq., is proprietor of a factory at Lowell, which employs 1,200 females, average wages \$2.00 per week—and 200 males, average wages \$3.00 per week. They manufacture 210,000 yards of cotton cloth per week. Assuming that the average cost of the goods manufactured by Mr. Lawrence is 12 cents per yard, the weekly value is \$252,000. By the tariff, this value is raised 30 per cent, \$75,500—equal at present rates to 1,700 bbls of flour. Now will Mr. Lawrence and the 1,400 people in his employ, eat an additional 1 1/4 barrel of flour, each, per week, because the farmers, through the intervention of the Government, are obliged to pay them 30 per cent more for the goods they manufacture? If they do not eat more bread in order to reduce the supply, will they voluntarily give \$2.00 per barrel above the market price, for what they do eat? It is impossible that the farmers will allow themselves to be extorted by such a pretence! The fact is that in this country the shipping, commercial and agricultural interests are identical. The farmers and planters produce more than the United States can consume, and they must find a foreign market for the surplus; and in so doing they must receive the commodities of the foreign market in payment. Precisely to the extent to which they do this, will the shipping and commercial interests prosper, and as their interests acquire wealth in traffic, will the home manufacturers really prosper. They must follow their customers and not attempt to lead them.

#### JOHN C. CALHOUN.

As this able statesman and honest patriot is to visit the north in November, we hope the Democracy of Portland will take early steps to invite him to this city. It would be a matter of profound gratification to the sterling men of the east to see and shake hands with him.

John C. Calhoun has ever been true to the cause of the masses. There is not a particle of aristocracy in his feelings or sentiments. We always knew where to find him, and that in every emergency he is trustworthy. The nation may well be proud of him for his single-hearted democracy, whole the intellect of all lands may be equally proud of his commanding abilities.—Portland American.

We cordially unite with our Portland friends in the hope that Mr. Calhoun may visit Maine while at the North. No man in our whole country unless it be old Hickory himself, could gather together such immense crowds of hard fast Democrats, to see and hear, as this great Statesman and Orator. No man can boast in this country of having retained through every vicissitude the confidence of the people of his own State so long and with so great unanimity as Mr. Calhoun. He carried South Carolina for Mr. Van Buren at the last Presidential election against the influence of such men as Senator Preston and General Thompson, with only ten dissenting votes. With the same influence against him he was reelected to the U. States Senate with the unanimous vote of the Legislature of South Carolina. We believe this case stands unparalleled in the history of our Republic.—(We would again express the hope that the people of Maine may have an opportunity to see and hear a Statesman that any nation at any age might well be proud of.)

FEDERAL COMPLIMENT.—The United States Gazette, in speaking of the recent Democratic triumph in Maine, says:—"Almost every thing proper and decent is prostrated, just as the track of a whirlwind, through a forest is marked by the destruction of the trees."

That's what we call a genuine, unadulterated, old fashioned federal sentiment. Guess the Editor didn't feel well.

The Hon. George McDuffie is recommended by the Democratic party of South Carolina, for the Senate of the United States, in place of Mr. Preston, whose term of service expires on the 4th of March next.

#### MR. WEBSTER'S SPEECH.

Mr. Webster, in his speech in Faneuil Hall, Boston on the 20th ult., wherein he declared that he would "define his position," places himself in open hostility to all the late movements of Mr. Clay, and not less openly condemns the late course of nearly the entire body of the Whig party. He insists that all the expected results of the Whig victory of 1840, might have been, and may yet be, realized; that bad temper and ill considered counsels have dictated the breach between the President and those who elected him; that instead of attempting what was practicable, Mr. Clay and his advisers have made ideal issues about proposed changes of the Constitution, which can never be accomplished; and that finally the whole course of events had been controlled by the personal spleen and personal ambition of the western orator, rather than by any sincere wish to carry out the great reforms promised to the people. For himself, Mr. Webster refuses to embark in the controversy with Mr. Tyler, and holds the political majority of Congress responsible for the past and future failure of Whig measures. He condemns Mr. Clay for making the issue with the President at the extra session, in relation to the control of the States over the establishment of branches by the proposed National Bank. Less distinctly, but still clearly enough, he condemns him for his position in respect to the tariff, which jeopardized that measure, and eventually made its passage dependent upon democratic votes. And lastly, he condemns Congress for refusing to adopt the President's plan of Exchequer, which he insists would accomplish all that his party have ever promised in relation to the currency.

This speech of Mr. Webster, says the Age, will produce a powerful impression upon the reflecting portion of the Whigs. Already distrustful as they are, of the furious and desperate policy of Mr. Clay, they will find all their doubts confirmed by the well argued strictures of one, to whom they have always looked with confidence, as an exponent of their principles.—In Massachusetts, where Mr. Webster is most strong, their effect will be decisive.

So far as the Democracy are concerned, their relations with Mr. Webster will not be altered by this speech. He still remains as ever before, the advocate of the most offensive federal tenets, and the quarrel between him and Mr. Clay, is merely upon the question, which of them has done the most to embody these tenets in the administration of the government.

He reaffirms all the positions in respect to the case of Alexander McLeod, which met the unanimous and intelligent rebuke of the Democracy in Congress, and throughout the country.

He takes upon himself the entire responsibility of the disgraceful Treaty negotiated with Great Britain, coupled with the declaration of general views of our policy towards England, which the Democracy have ever repudiated.

He reaffirms his adherence to the extreme system of protective and prohibitive duties.

He advocates the active policy of distributing the proceeds of the public lands, and even lists at the still more odious policy of assuming the debts of the States.

He expresses his disapprobation of all the Vetoes of President Tyler; every one of which has been heartily sustained by the entire Democracy.

In reference to the currency, he repeats and enlarges all that has ever been insisted upon by his party, in respect to the necessity of subjecting it to national control. And although he treats an impracticable, the idea of a national bank having a capital based upon private subscription, he advocates a paper money machine, ready more patent for every purpose of mischief and corruption.

Mr. Webster is, in fine, Mr. Webster still; English, federal, and aristocratic. With him, or with those who act with him, the Democracy can have no fellowship.

#### NEW POLITICAL MOVEMENTS.

The Tyler Post Master at Portland has taken the Post Office printing from the Advertiser and given it to the Argus. Something new under a Federal Administration! But this extraordinary movement points an expedition of ours.

F. O. J. Smith has just returned from Washington, and his last interview Mr. Calhoun, now chief of the Argus, has gone to Washington to see Capt. Tyler, &c. Reports say that the Eastern Argus will have the public printing under the present Administration, and F. O. J. Smith have the appointment of Postmaster at Portland. Time will develop the whole matter.

"In Woodstock in Maine one party seems to have what politicians term a 'majority sufficient for all practical purposes.' The vote at the last election stood Whig 1, Democratic 123. How far is it from Hornby?"—Barre Gazette.

A small mistake, Mr. Gazette. Substitute an 8, instead of 1, for the Whigs. Coon skins are scarce in that town. There was but three in 1840, and they have changed their color, with a few others, from some cause—probably from the effect of the vetoes. Hornby is a decided Whig town at the head of Salt River, and one hundred miles from the Whig Head Quarters and in the same latitude of the Algerines of R. I.

WM. B. BRAY, Esq. (dem.) was elected Representative from Turner and Hebron on Wednesday last.

Thanksgiving.—In Massachusetts November 24th; in New Hampshire 22nd of December.

The offer of \$5,000 reward for the arrest of Gov. Dorr, and his delivery to the King of Rhode Island, expired on the 29th ult.

A noble sentiment.—Bear it in mind, and vote accordingly, that a poor man's soul, body, and mind, are just as sacred to God and the American Constitution as those of a rich one.

John C. Coll, was brought before the Court of Oyer and Terminer, New York, on the 27th ult. and sentenced, by Judge Kent, to be hung on the 18th day of November next, for the murder of Samuel Adams.

The Boston Post says,—Mr. Clay used to be called the great pacificator; but now, as he is the embodiment of Whig principles, he is to be called the great personifier.

Everything for  
publish the follo  
Benton, which i  
the present con  
is organizing an  
principles, pol  
of free governme  
To the Editors o

Gentlemen—  
your kind and  
no forward as a  
United States, I  
you that I have  
to be brought fo  
last summer, g  
effect, to the ca  
ing of the demo  
of Philadelphia  
dings of the m  
that you will p  
this note, that  
tion on this poi  
lie is that the  
next election, a  
cessful, and for  
motto—"Every  
Yet

Heroes of the  
ted States just  
on the pension  
The oldest man  
county, Pennsylv

MR. WEBSTER  
The New York  
the following:  
"The friends  
are 'one and in  
of that party ag  
no Democratic  
there is no lea  
ousies to distr  
from the great  
my. They were  
that glorious  
is once more  
between Faneu  
more of 'accu  
ties; each see  
that is not far  
has long been  
days, indicated  
to his death  
or the Union  
Power," &c. &c.  
brought to be  
Why not have  
gle sentence,  
there have been

The Madisonian  
editorial, comm  
we have no fu  
inquire, how  
Webster with  
only a profess  
first place in  
regards econo  
and has be  
Does the situa  
him, in the re  
eratic side of  
as in the day  
Democrat?"

The Madisonian  
editorial, comm  
we have no fu  
inquire, how  
Webster with  
only a profess  
first place in  
regards econo  
and has be  
Does the situa  
him, in the re  
eratic side of  
as in the day  
Democrat?"

The Madisonian  
editorial, comm  
we have no fu  
inquire, how  
Webster with  
only a profess  
first place in  
regards econo  
and has be  
Does the situa  
him, in the re  
eratic side of  
as in the day  
Democrat?"

The Madisonian  
editorial, comm  
we have no fu  
inquire, how  
Webster with  
only a profess  
first place in  
regards econo  
and has be  
Does the situa  
him, in the re  
eratic side of  
as in the day  
Democrat?"

The Madisonian  
editorial, comm  
we have no fu  
inquire, how  
Webster with  
only a profess  
first place in  
regards econo  
and has be  
Does the situa  
him, in the re  
eratic side of  
as in the day  
Democrat?"

The Madisonian  
editorial, comm  
we have no fu  
inquire, how  
Webster with  
only a profess  
first place in  
regards econo  
and has be  
Does the situa  
him, in the re  
eratic side of  
as in the day  
Democrat?"

The Madisonian  
editorial, comm  
we have no fu  
inquire, how  
Webster with  
only a profess  
first place in  
regards econo  
and has be  
Does the situa  
him, in the re  
eratic side of  
as in the day  
Democrat?"

The Madisonian  
editorial, comm  
we have no fu  
inquire, how  
Webster with  
only a profess  
first place in  
regards econo  
and has be  
Does the situa  
him, in the re  
eratic side of  
as in the day  
Democrat?"

The Madisonian  
editorial, comm  
we have no fu  
inquire, how  
Webster with  
only a profess  
first place in  
regards econo  
and has be  
Does the situa  
him, in the re  
eratic side of  
as in the day  
Democrat?"

The Madisonian  
editorial, comm  
we have no fu  
inquire, how  
Webster with  
only a profess  
first place in  
regards econo  
and has be  
Does the situa  
him, in the re  
eratic side of  
as in the day  
Democrat?"

The Madisonian  
editorial, comm  
we have no fu  
inquire, how  
Webster with  
only a profess  
first place in  
regards econo  
and has be  
Does the situa  
him, in the re  
eratic side of  
as in the day  
Democrat?"

The Madisonian  
editorial, comm  
we have no fu  
inquire, how  
Webster with  
only a profess  
first place in  
regards econo  
and has be  
Does the situa  
him, in the re  
eratic side of  
as in the day  
Democrat?"

The Madisonian  
editorial, comm  
we have no fu  
inquire, how  
Webster with  
only a profess  
first place in  
regards econo  
and has be  
Does the situa  
him, in the re  
eratic side of  
as in the day  
Democrat?"

The Madisonian  
editorial, comm  
we have no fu  
inquire, how  
Webster with  
only a profess  
first place in  
regards econo  
and has be  
Does the situa  
him, in the re  
eratic side of  
as in the day  
Democrat?"



**SALT RHEUM.**

THE subscriber having, as he has reason to believe, dis covered a certain cure for the Salt Rheum; and which may also be considered as a remedy for various other humors or cutaneous diseases, would inform the public that he has applied for and received the United States Letters Patent, from the proper authority at the city of Washington, for said remedy, which he denominates a Compound for the cure of the Salt Rheum and other Diseases of the Skin.

He is aware that some may doubt whether there is any cure for the disease. He has often seen to the contrary. Many times he has achieved impossible and now accomplished cures.

However, once discovered, by him, and by experience, it is no longer a doubtful question. He was himself dreadfully afflicted with it more than twenty years, and at times, for months together, was unable to labor, and sometimes even to sit, dress himself, or apply to many physicians, and tried various things prescribed by them and others, but he was very sick with the disease, and he had well nigh given up all hope of recovery. At that time, he received from a friend a list of articles, chiefly indigenous to our own fields and forests, and admitted to be good for the cure of the disease, which articles he immediately tried, and found to some effect. With these things, and others, which he had found in some of his journeys, he compounded a compound, and applied it to his diseased and distressed frame. In three weeks, (the cure going with truth and pleasure, and he sought to give it with much gratitude,) he was comparatively well; and shortly after was restored to perfect health, so far as regards Salt Rheum; and continues so to this day, a period of seven years.

Thousands of persons afflicted by this grievous malady, have made use of this remedy, and as far as he has seen, it has rarely failed to give satisfaction. In many cases it was good, where there has been truly wonderful.

He will not state, as too many do, that his Compound is a cure for all diseases; but he has reason to believe that it is not only a cure for the Salt Rheum, but good for all humors, such as Ring Worm, Scald Head, Shingles, Leprosy, Itch, and especially good for the barber's or Jackson itch, &c. &c. It has also been used for the Piles with the best effect.

No person can get any evil from it, however old, or young, or male, for it is simple and may be used with safety.

The following certificates and recommendations show how successful this remedy is, when properly applied, viz:—

Mr. N. A. Sprague, Agent for Naumuck, in a letter dated April 24th, 1840, to the patentee, says:—Many cures have been performed on this Island, by using your Compound. In fact, some instances where I have sold your Salt Rheum, it has failed to give great satisfaction. I wish you to send me another box containing as the last, viz. 100 packages.

This newly discovered and valuable medicine, Truant's Patent Compound, has already been proved by his own trials in this vicinity, to be a simple and may be used with safety. It has effected cures for

**REGULAR PHYSICIANS** and declares that his patients were incurable.

From the Portland Christian Mirror.

**SALT RHEUM.—TRUANT'S COMPOUND.**

We copy the following paragraph from the Lincoln Telegraph published in Bath, the residence of Mr. Truaut. The chamberlain of the man, the circumstances in which he was discovered, and the cure, as well as the many effluents to which this remedy has been subjected, are an adequate ground to the public against imputation. The use of it by a member of our family has done much to secure our confidence in its efficacy. We hope Mr. Truaut will not suffer his case in the preparation to state a single line, in consequence of the growing demand for his compound, but let it not degenerate.

**Remedy for Salt Rheum.**—We call attention to the advertisement of this valuable medicine in another column. It has been supposed that no infallible remedy for this base and disease could be found. But from the numerous testimonials from the friends of the man, and the many effluents to which this remedy has been subjected, are an adequate ground to the public against imputation. The use of it by a member of our family has done much to secure our confidence in its efficacy. We hope Mr. Truaut will not suffer his case in the preparation to state a single line, in consequence of the growing demand for his compound, but let it not degenerate.

The undersigned, inhabitants of Bath, certify that we have used the medicine prepared by William B. Truaut, at a number of times, and have found it to be the best we have ever known; and having no doubts that it is a valuable discovery, take the liberty to recommend it to all who are afflicted with that inveterate malady.

Daniel Robinson, Jr.  
John Jackson, Jr.  
E. W. Turner,  
A. L. Stimson,  
James Hamilton,  
Henry C. Donnell,  
Thos. P. J. Webb,  
Lewis Larratt.

Prepared and sold by the subscriber at his shop in Water street, Bath, Maine. Also by

Wm. E. GOODNOW, Norway,  
Agent for the County of Oxford.

The following persons are also appointed Agents, viz:—Andrew, Lewis Crockett; Bethel Hill, E. A. Chapman & Co.; Dismal, C. T. Chace; Greenwood, J. & S. Stevens; Harford, W. Hall; Woodstock, J. R. Briggs; Bowdoin, W. C. Robinson; Sumner, Waterford, John, Goodnow; Milroy, Lovejoy.

Price.—One Dollar, with full directions.  
All letters from abroad must be paid post.

March 3, 1842. Wm. B. TRUANT, copy43

**Rare Work,**

CONTAINING the difficult questions well explained from the various works on Arithmetic. Teachers intending to be beyond the reach of the attack of thieves and the ill-disposed will find it all the necessary assistance that respects the subject.

The following names explained, were taken from the following named Authors, viz:

Watts, Walsh, Kenne, Adams, Smith, Price, Babbell, Emerson, Greenleaf, Olney, and several others.

In fact, every item deemed intricate, rare, useful or entertaining occupies its proper place in this work, and matter considered of a common and superficial nature is carefully excluded.

**KEY TO THE VARIOUS AUTHORS ON ARITHMETIC.**

For sale at this Office.

At a Court of Probate held at Turner, within and for the County of Oxford, on the 23d day of September, in the year of our Lord eighteen hundred and forty-two,

**Ambrose Blaise**, Administrator of the estate of John Disher, late of Turner, in said county, deceased, having presented his first account of administration of the estate of said deceased.—It was

**Ordered**,  
That the said Administrator give notice to all persons interested, by causing a copy of this order to be published three times successively in the Oxford Democrat printed at Paris, that they may appear at a Probate Court to be held in Paris, in said county, on the 1st day of October next, at ten o'clock in the forenoon, and show cause, if any they have, why the said account should not be allowed.

**GEO. F. EMERY, Register.**  
Attest.—GEO. F. EMERY, Register.

A true Copy,  
At a Court of Probate held at Turner, within and for the County of Oxford, on the 22d day of September, in the year of our Lord eighteen hundred and forty-two,

**George French**, Executor of the last Will and Testament of Daniel French, late of Turner, in said county, deceased, having presented his first account of administration of the estate of said deceased.—It was

**Ordered**,  
That the said Executor give notice to all persons interested, by causing a copy of this order to be published three times successively in the Oxford Democrat printed at Paris, that they may appear at a Probate Court to be held in Paris, in said county, on the 1st day of October next, at ten o'clock in the forenoon and show cause, if any they have, why the said account should not be allowed.

**GEO. F. EMERY, Register.**  
Attest.—GEO. F. EMERY, Register.



